

AR1010

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

In the Matter of:
SHELL OIL COMPANY; UNION OIL
COMPANY; TEXACO, INC.; ATLANTIC
RICHFIELD COMPANY; GETTY OIL
COMPANY; AMINOIL, INC.; MCAULEY
OIL COMPANY; ERIC EULEN.

Respondents.

Docket No. 84-13

Proceeding under Section 106
of the Comprehensive Environ-
mental Response, Compensation
and Liability Act of 1980,
42 U.S.C. §9606.

ORDER

This Administrative Order (Order) is issued to the above-named Respondents by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), pursuant to Section 106(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §9606(a), by authority delegated to the undersigned by the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Notice of the issuance of this Order has been provided to the State of California.

1 FINDINGS OF FACT

2 Site Location/Respondents

3 1. This Order relates to two parcels of land located south
4 of Rosecrans Avenue and west of Sunny Ridge Drive in Fullerton,
5 Orange County, California, known as the McColl site (the "site").
6 The site is comprised of two distinct parcels of land: the
7 7-acre "Ramparts" parcel, an undeveloped area, and the 3.5-acre
8 "Los Coyotes" parcel, an operating private golf course. The site
9 constitutes a facility as defined in §101(9) of CERCLA.

10 2. Respondent Shell Oil Company ("Shell") is incorporated
11 under the laws of the State of Delaware. Shell arranged for dis-
12 posal or transport for disposal at the site of hazardous sub-
13 stances generated at one or more of its facilities in the South-
14 ern California area.

15 3. Respondent Union Oil Company ("Union") is incorporated
16 under the laws of the State of California. Union arranged for
17 disposal or transport for disposal at the site of hazardous sub-
18 stances generated at one or more of its facilities in the South-
19 ern California area.

20 4. Respondent Texaco, Inc. ("Texaco") is incorporated under
21 the laws of the State of Delaware. Texaco arranged for disposal
22 or transport for disposal at the site of hazardous substances
23 generated at one or more of its facilities in the Southern Cali-
24 fornia area.

25 5. Respondent Atlantic Richfield Company ("ARCO") is in-
26 corporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania. ARCO
27 arranged for disposal or transport for disposal at the site of
28 hazardous substances generated at one or more of its facilities

1 in the Southern California area.

2 6. Respondent Getty Oil Company ("Getty") is incorporated
3 under the laws of the State of Delaware. Getty arranged for dis-
4 posal or transport for disposal at the site of hazardous sub-
5 stances generated at one or more of its facilities in the South-
6 ern California area.

7 7. Respondent Aminoil, Inc. ("Aminoil") is incorporated
8 under the laws of the State of Delaware. Aminoil arranged for
9 disposal or transport for disposal at the site of hazardous
10 substances generated at one or more of its facilities in the
11 Southern California area.

12 8. McCauley Oil Company ("McAuley") is incorporated under
13 the laws of the State of California. McAuley is the owner of
14 the "Los Coyotes" parcel at the McColl site.

15 9. Eric Eulen is a resident of the State of California,
16 and EPA believes he is the owner of the "Ramparts" parcel.

17 Site History

18 10. The site was created as a disposal area for acid sludge
19 wastes from the production of high octane aviation fuel. From
20 1942 to 1946, acid wastes from Southern California refineries
21 were disposed of in the sumps created on the property, which was
22 then in a rural area of Orange County. From 1951 to 1962, drilling
23 muds were deposited on a portion of the Ramparts parcel in an
24 attempt to mitigate the hazard that had been created by the acid
25 wastes. In 1957, the Los Coyotes Golf Course and Country Club was
26 constructed on top of the western six sumps. In the 1960's, de-
27 velopers began to build homes in the area adjacent to the site.
28 Today, about 1,200 people live within one-half mile of the site.

Site Characterization

11. In 1982, Radian Corporation and TRC, Inc. conducted a characterization of the site and produced a report ("the Radian report"), funded by the State of California and four Respondents: Shell, Texaco, ARCO, and Union. The work consisted of surface and deep subsurface soil sampling, air emissions sampling and modeling from surface chambers, shallow mapping tubes, deep soil coreholes, a trench excavation to determine the depth of the wastes, air sampling and mapping of the extent and degree of the odors in the community, and limited groundwater monitoring.

12. According to the Radian report, approximately 150,000 cubic yards of waste and contaminated soil occupy 12 sumps on the site. The report states that the waste itself consists of 85,000 cubic yards of black, tar-like waste, hard asphaltic waste, and grey sludge-like drilling mud, characterized by a low pH (acid), high sulfur content, and high concentrations of organic sulfur, aromatics (benzenes) and aliphatic (straightchain) hydrocarbons. The soil below the waste has been contaminated by the acid component and the odiferous chemicals of the waste. Gas emissions from the undisturbed site produce low concentrations of sulfur dioxide and total hydrocarbons at the border of the site. Gas emissions also include benzene, toluene, and xylene. The chemical group of tetrahydrothiophenes is a cause of the odor problem in the community. This chemical is irritating to the human sense of smell in concentrations of a fraction of a part per billion, lower than can be detected in a laboratory. If the waste cap material is disturbed and the waste exposed without proper precautions, the gas emissions increase to about

1 1,000 to 10,000 times that of the undisturbed contaminants.
2 Arsenic has been detected in the soil on one portion of the
3 site.

4 Sampling Data

5 13. The California Department of Health Services (DOHS)
6 analyzed air emissions from the site based on available data
7 from air sampling studies conducted by a number of agencies and
8 private companies. DOHS analysis indicates that there may be
9 about 50 substances in the air during odor episodes (times when
10 wind carries the chemicals into the adjoining residential area)
11 that could be attributed to the dump. The following substances
12 are attributable to the McColl site (substances identified in
13 air samples but not present in site waste material are not in-
14 cluded in this list):

15 A. Alkanes, Alkenes and Alcohols

16 2-Methylbutane
17 1,1-Dimethylcyclopropane
18 Hexane
19 2-Methylhexane
20 Heptane
21 2,5-Dimethylhexane
22 2,3,4-Trimethylpentane
23 Pentane
24 2-Methylpentane
25 Methylcyclopentane
26 2,3-Dimethylpentane
27 Methylcyclohexane
28 2,2-Dimethylhexane

- 1 2,3,3-Trimethylpentane
- 2 2,3-Dimethylhexane
- 3 2,2,5-Trimethylhexane
- 4 Isooctane
- 5 Pentene
- 6 4-Methylcyclopentene
- 7 Butanol
- 8 2-Butoxyethanol
- 9 3-Methylheptane
- 10 Nonane
- 11 2-Pentene
- 12 3-Methylpentane
- 13 2-Ethyl-1-hexanol
- 14 Ethanol

15 B. Aromatics

- 16 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene
- 17 o-xylene
- 18 Naphthalene
- 19 Toluene
- 20 m,p-xylene
- 21 Ethylbenzene

22 C. Thioethers

- 23 Tetrahydrothiophene

24 D. Sulfur Dioxide

25 E. Carbon Disulfide

26 F. Benzene

- 27 14. Analysis of samples from the waste site for pH by Radian
- 28 and the State of California Department of Health Services (DOHS)

1 revealed that the waste is acidic, with the pH ranging from 0.17
2 to 1.8.

3 15. On October 9, 1980, EPA and the California DOHS sampled
4 waste from the site, with selected results as follows:

5	<u>Compound</u>	<u>Concentration</u>
	Arsenic	None Detected to 190 ppm
6	Benzene	<90 to 880 mg/kg
	Toluene	130 to 810 mg/kg
7	Tetrahydrothiophene	75 to 140 mg/kg

8 16. A sample of waste from the site collected by the
9 California DOHS on December 3, 1980, had an arsenic concentration
10 of 10,100 ug/g.

11 17. EPA's analysis of waste and soil samples collected
12 January 13, 1981, revealed the following concentrations:

13	<u>Compound</u>	<u>Concentration</u>
	Benzene	5.6 to 220 mg/kg
14	Toluene	26 to 150 mg/kg
15	Xylene	None Detected to 660 mg/kg

16 18. Samples of waste from the site collected by California
17 DOHS on June 1, 1981, revealed arsenic concentrations from
18 <1.0 to 222.0 ug/g.

19 19. The State of California Air Resources Board analyzed
20 emissions from soil and sludge from the site at room temperature
21 as follows:

22	<u>Compound</u>	<u>Concentration</u>
	Benzene	20 to 300 ppm
23	Toluene	9 to 100 ppm
	Xylene	10 to 100 ppm
24	Aliphatic Hydrocarbons	7 to 1600 ppm

25 20. The California Air Resources Board sampled ambient air
26 during coring on-site by California DOHS in November 1980 with
27 the following results:

28 ///

1	<u>Compound</u>	<u>Concentration</u>
2	Benzene	8.2 to 43 ppm
3	Sulfur Dioxide	280 to 38,000 ppm

4 21. In 1982, TRC Environmental Consultants, Inc. under
5 contract to the California DOHS, measured air emissions contain-
6 ing sulfur dioxide (SO₂) at the site perimeter during coring and
7 trenching on-site by DOHS. SO₂ levels ranged from 10 to 2500
8 ppb. During the same time period benzene monitors in the community
9 registered 5 to 170 ppb.

10 22. Arsenic concentrations from 0.043 to 0.523 mg/l and
11 pH of 2.5 to 7.54 were found by the California Regional Water
12 Quality Control Board in water runoff sampled from the site on
13 January 21, 1982.

14 23. Benzene, toluene, xylene, and arsenic are hazardous
15 substances as defined in §101(14) of CERCLA.

16 Endangerment

17 24. (A) Air Contaminants

18 Benzene, toluene and xylene, sulfur dioxide, and sulfur-
19 containing organics are the most significant hazards to human
20 health which are transmitted through the air.

21 (1) Benzene. Benzene has been detected in community air
22 samples taken from the site. Benzene acts as a narcotic on the
23 central nervous system. Acute benzene poisoning commences with
24 nausea, vomiting, ataxia, and excitement, followed by depression
25 and coma. Death can occur because of respiratory or cardiac fail-
26 ure. An exposure to 20,000 parts per million can be fatal within
27 5 to 10 minutes. Exposure to 100 parts per million daily can
28 cause confusion, dizziness, fatigue, headache, nausea, and coma.
There appears to be a correlation between benzene exposure and

1 leukemia in humans. Although benzene emissions from the undis-
2 turbed site have not been measured at hazardous levels, higher
3 emissions have been measured from the disturbed site. Moreover,
4 the threat of a benzene release from a site disturbance, such as
5 an earthquake, may present a substantial danger to the surrounding
6 community.

7 (2) Toluene and Xylene. Toluene and xylene have been
8 detected in waste samples and air emissions from the site. Inha-
9 lation of toluene vapors may produce irritation of the upper
10 respiratory tract, disturbance of vision, dizziness, nausea,
11 collapse, and coma. Direct contact with skin and eyes causes
12 burning. Inhalation of 200 parts per million for 8 hours may
13 cause impairment of coordination or reaction time. Concentrations
14 of 200 to 500 parts per million may cause headache, nausea, loss
15 of appetite, lassitude, and impairment of coordination and reaction
16 time. Higher concentrations may cause anemia, leucopenia and
17 enlargement of the liver.

18 (3) Sulfur Dioxide. Sulfur dioxide has been detected
19 in community air samples and in air emission samples taken at the
20 site. At concentrations as low as 0.09 parts per million, sulfur
21 dioxide acts as a respiratory irritant. During site disturbances,
22 sulfur dioxide levels in the community have reached 1,000 parts
23 per million. On-site emissions can be much higher, posing an
24 imminent hazard to anyone disturbing the site.

25 (4) Sulfur-Containing Organics. These organics, which
26 have been detected in community air samples, cause unpleasant odors
27 at extremely low concentrations -- part-per-billion levels. EPA
28 knows of no studies of the effects of such chemicals on humans.

1 (B) Water Contaminants

2 Storm water runoff from the site has contained arsenic
3 in excess of the Federal drinking water standard. Samples of
4 perched groundwater at 15 to 42 feet underlying the site reveal
5 low pH and high arsenic and sulfate levels. The McColl site is
6 underlain by a mixture of mudstone, sandstone and pebbly sand-
7 stone. Observation at and near the site reveal that the under-
8 lying soil contains an assemblage of lenses and layers of
9 clay, silt, sand and gravel. If the waste remains on site,
10 there are no known barriers to prevent the migration of hazardous
11 substances at the site into the ground water.

12 (C) Endangerment Through Direct Contact

13 People regularly walk upon the Los Coyotes parcel, which
14 is used for a golf course. The Ramparts parcel, although fenced,
15 is bordered by homes to the east and south, and the fence has
16 not prevented children and others from entering the land. The
17 two primary direct contact hazards are ingestion of arsenic and
18 contact with acidic sludge.

19 (1) Arsenic. Arsenic has been detected in waste samples
20 collected at the site in concentrations of 10,100 ug/g. There
21 is strong evidence that arsenic is a skin and lung carcinogen in
22 humans. Although the fatal dose of arsenic depends on body
23 weight, ingestion of a "pinch" of soil of such concentration
24 could produce acute poisoning, especially in children.

25 (2) Acidic Sludge. Acidic liquids oozing near the sur-
26 face pose a danger to humans. Golfers and children looking for
27 lost golf balls are likely to be exposed to direct contact

28 ///

1 with the waste, which can cause burns to the eyes and skin. The
2 State DOHS Health Survey identified the significant risks of harm
3 to people from direct contact with the site:

4 "Scientists from the [State of California] Department
5 of Health Services are concerned about the potential health
6 effects from direct contact with waste materials on these
7 sites. Seepage materials on the Los Coyotes Golf Course
8 are very acidic and could cause burns to the eyes or skin
9 from direct contact. On the Ramparts portion of the McColl
10 site there is also the potential for acid burns. Digging
11 of a shallow hole a foot or two deep could release a quantity
12 of sulfur dioxide gas measurable in the thousands of parts
13 per million range. This could cause respiratory burns or
14 precipitate an asthmatic attack in individuals who are stand-
15 ing within a few feet of the hole. Finally, there is at
16 least one area (near the southwest corner of Ramparts) with
17 concentrations of arsenic sufficiently high that accidental
18 ingestion of a pinch of soil could produce acute poisoning
19 within 48 hours. These facts lead scientists and physicians
20 from the Department of Health Services to conclude that
21 direct contact with the site poses a significant public
22 health hazard." ("The McColl Site Health Survey, An Epide-
23 miological and Toxicological Assessment of the McColl Haz-
24 ardous Waste Disposal Site," August 1983, p. 9.)

25 (D) Documented Human Health Symptoms

26 There are approximately 1,200 people living within one-
27 half mile of the site. The State of California Department of
28 Health Services Epidemiological Studies Section conducted an

1 epidemiological and toxicological assessment of nearby residents
2 which was completed in August, 1983. Among the study findings
3 were the following:

4 (1) Adults and children in the area show an excess of such
5 symptoms as eye irritation, nausea, headaches, and sore throats.

6 (2) Complaints of odor were much more common from resi-
7 dents of the McColl area than from residents of the control area.

8 (3) The number of physician consultations per child were
9 higher in the McColl area than in the control area.

10 (4) More women in the McColl area reported disturbances
11 with their menstrual pattern than in the control area.

12 (5) It is impossible now to adequately assess whether the
13 McColl site presents a danger of increased cancer or birth defects
14 to area residents. A small population, followed for only a few
15 years after first exposure, would not be expected to have a de-
16 tectable increase in cancer rates. The population surrounding
17 the site is much smaller than that necessary for adequate epide-
18 miological studies. In order to detect a statistically significant
19 difference in symptoms such as cancer, miscarriage, stillbirths,
20 prematurity, and birth defects, the residents near the site would
21 have to exhibit five to twenty times more symptoms than the
22 control neighborhood. No differences of that magnitude have been
23 detected. Differences of a lesser, though still serious, magni-
24 tude cannot be ruled out, however.

25 Earthquake Danger

26 25. The McColl site is located on the Coyote Hills uplift.
27 A low scarp along the south margin of the Coyote Hills is surface
28 evidence of an active fault, and a source of earthquakes. There

1 have been earthquakes of magnitude 6 or greater in this area in
2 the past, and the Seismologist for the California Division of
3 Mines and Geology states that it is reasonable to expect similar
4 and larger shocks in the future. There are seven active faults
5 within 16 miles of the McColl site: the Norwalk, El Modeno,
6 Whittier, Elsinore, Whittier-Elsinore, Newport-Inglewood, and
7 the offshore zone of deformation (ranging from the Newport-Ingle-
8 wood fault to the north to and including the Rose Canyon fault
9 on the south). The closest fault is the Norwalk, less than one
10 mile from the site.

11 26. The State DOHS made stability analyses of postulated
12 failure surfaces along nine (9) cross sections of the site
13 (through three places on the lower berm and six places on the
14 upper berm). Under conditions of seismic shaking, two (2) of the
15 cross sections would fail (there would be earth movement) when
16 dry and seven (7) would fail when saturated.

17 27. The State Department of Health Services Geotechnical
18 investigation of the McColl site indicated that an earthquake of
19 magnitude 6 or greater would cause "a slumping of the complete
20 upper berm and a significant slump of the lower berm" into a
21 backyard adjacent to the site, and that there could be enough
22 offsite movement for mudflow to reach the edge of the swimming
23 pool on the lot adjacent to the lower berm. The State report
24 concluded:

25 "The most significant aspect of these failures [of
26 the berms] would be a rupture of the waste, with as much
27 as 3,000 square feet of exposed surface area. This would
28 allow the release of a significant amount of noxious gases,

1 consisting of SO₂, H₂S, and others." ("Geotechnical In-
2 vestigation of the McColl Site," January 8, 1982, Alterna-
3 tive Technology and Policy Development Section, Department
4 of Health Services, p. 5.)

5 Administrative Actions

6 28. On January 13, 1984, the California Department of Health
7 Services determined, on the basis of its factual review of the
8 site, that there may be an imminent or substantial endangerment
9 to the health or welfare or to the environment at the site. The
10 Department's principal findings and recommendations were sum-
11 marized as follows:

12 "The McColl hazardous waste site in Fullerton con-
13 sists of acid refinery sludge high in sulfur compounds.
14 Four of the sumps are exposed on land adjacent to a re-
15 sidential development. There has been a history of odor
16 complaints due to emissions of sulfur dioxide, thiophenes
17 and other hydrocarbons. Sulfur dioxide is found on site
18 and is highly toxic at the concentrations observed. A
19 temporary cover was placed over four of the sumps to stop
20 the emission of gases. This was only intended as an in-
21 terim measure and is now resulting in emissions reoccurring.
22 A health study has indicated that the site has had mea-
23 surable health effects such as asthma, headaches, and sore
24 throats of residents in the neighborhood. This represents
25 an imminent or substantial endangerment to public health
26 and the environment due to a threatened release of haz-
27 ardous substance[s]."

28 ///

1 29. On April 11, 1984, the Environmental Protection Agency
2 determined that excavation and redisposal of the waste and con-
3 taminated soil at the McColl site was the cost-effective reme-
4 dial alternative, pursuant to 40 CFR §300.68(j). A Record of
5 Decision, signed by Lee Thomas, Assistant Administrator for
6 Solid Waste and Emergency Response, on April 11, 1984, is incor-
7 portated herein as Appendix C.

8 ///

9 ///

10 ///

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1
2 1. The Ramparts parcel and the Los Coyotes parcel of
3 the McColl site are "facilities" as defined in Section 101(9)
4 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9601(9).

5 2. Respondents are "persons" as defined in Section
6 101(21) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9601(21).

7 3. Wastes sent to and disposed of at the site by Re-
8 spondents include "hazardous substances" as defined in Section
9 101(14) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9601(14).

10 4. The past, present, and potential migration of haz-
11 ardous substances from the facilities into the air and water
12 constitutes actual and threatened "release" as defined in
13 Section 101(22) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9601(22).

14 5. Respondents McAuley Oil Company and Eric Eulen are
15 responsible parties pursuant to §107(a)(1) of CERCLA, because
16 they are the present owners of the site.

17 6. The Generator-Respondents (those respondents not iden-
18 tified in the preceding paragraph) are each responsible parties
19 pursuant to §107(a)(3) of CERCLA because they each arranged
20 for the disposal or treatment, or transport for disposal or
21 treatment at the site, of hazardous substances owned or
22 possessed by them.

23 7. The Respondents are jointly and severally liable for
24 undertaking the response action required by this order unless
25 specifically indicated otherwise.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DETERMINATIONS

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, EPA has determined that:

1. The actual and threatened release of hazardous substances from the facility may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to the public health, welfare, and the environment.

2. The response actions required by this Order are necessary to protect public health and welfare and the environment.

///

///

///

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, and DETERMINATIONS, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

I. Implementation of Remedial Plan

Respondents jointly and severally shall implement, at their own expense, the Remedial Plan described in Appendix A of this Order. Respondents may utilize the specifications established by DOHS, set forth in Appendix B, or may develop their own specifications to implement the Remedial Plan described in Appendix A. This Plan requires the excavation of the McColl waste and contaminated soil, its disposal at a suitable disposal site, and monitoring of the site for contaminants. Respondents shall implement the Plan in accordance with the following timetable:

A. Within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Order, Respondents shall submit a detailed work plan and implementation schedule for the Remedial Action activities described in Appendix A. Respondents shall simultaneously submit to EPA for review and approval a proposal for a financial assurance mechanism (such as a trust fund or escrow account) sufficient to guarantee operation and maintenance and monitoring of the site in perpetuity.

B. Upon approval of the work plan and schedule by EPA, Respondents shall complete the Remedial Action in accordance with the approved plan and schedule, but in no event later than 20 months from the effective date of this Order. Immediately upon EPA approval of the proposed financial assurance mechanism, Respondents shall cause that mechanism to be established.

1 C. Upon completion of the Remedial Action, Respondents
2 shall submit to EPA for review and approval, a final report
3 which describes in detail all work undertaken, data, re-
4 sults, evaluations, conclusions, and recommendations. In
5 the event of disapproval of the report, EPA shall inform
6 Respondents of the deficiencies, and Respondents shall make
7 modifications, acquire additional information, and otherwise
8 act to correct the deficiencies.

9 D. Respondents shall provide for operation, maintenance
10 and monitoring of the site in accordance with the plans and
11 schedule in the approved Remedial Action work plan submittal.

12 II. Project Coordinators

13 Within fifteen (15) days of the effective date of this Order,
14 each Respondent shall designate, and provide EPA with the name
15 and address of, a Project Coordinator whose responsibilities
16 will be to receive all notices, comments, approvals and other
17 communications from EPA to the Respondent. Each Respondent
18 shall coordinate its activities pursuant to this Order with all
19 other Respondents to ensure successful completion of all required
20 actions. In the event that Respondents choose to designate a
21 single Project Coordinator to represent all or some of the Re-
22 spondents for this purpose, EPA shall be so notified.

23 III. Endangerment During Implementation

24 In the event that the Regional Administrator of EPA, Region
25 9, determines that any activities (whether pursued in implemen-
26 tation of or in noncompliance with this Order) or circumstances
27 are creating an imminent and substantial endangerment to the
28 health and welfare of people on the site or in the surrounding

1 area or to the environment, the Regional Administrator of EPA,
2 Region 9, may order Respondents to stop further implementation
3 of this Order for such period of time as needed to abate the
4 endangerment.

5 IV. Compliance with Applicable Laws

6 All actions carried out by Respondents pursuant to this
7 Order shall be done in accordance with all applicable Federal,
8 State and local requirements, including requirements to obtain
9 necessary permits and to assure workers' safety.

10 V. Monitoring

11 Upon request, Respondents will provide EPA with split sam-
12 ples of any samples collected on the site. Respondents shall
13 provide EPA with at least seven (7) days notice prior to any
14 sampling undertaken pursuant to this Order.

15 VI. Incorporation of Documents

16 Any reports, plans, specifications, schedules and other
17 documents required by the terms of this Order are, upon written
18 approval by EPA, incorporated as a part of this Order.

19 VII. Enforcement

20 Violation of this Order shall be enforceable pursuant to
21 Sections 106(b) and 113(b) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606(b) and
22 9613(b).

23 VIII. Penalties for Noncompliance

24 Failure to comply may also subject Respondents to civil
25 penalties and/or punitive damages in an amount up to three
26 times the amount of any costs incurred by the United States as
27 a result of such failure, as provided in Sections 106(b) and

28 ///

1 107(c)(3) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606(b) and 9607(c)(3). Nothing
2 herein shall preclude EPA from taking such other actions as
3 may be necessary to protect the public health or welfare or
4 the environment and recovering the costs thereof.

5 IX. Liability

6 Nothing herein shall constitute or be construed as a satis-
7 faction or release from liability for any conditions or claims
8 arising as a result of past, current or future operations at the
9 facility. Notwithstanding compliance with the terms of this
10 Order, Respondents may be required to take further actions as are
11 necessary to protect public health or welfare or the environment.

12 X. Performance

13 All response work performed pursuant to this Order shall be
14 under the direction and supervision of a qualified professional
15 engineer or certified geologist with expertise and experience in
16 hazardous waste site cleanup. Respondents shall provide EPA with
17 the name(s) of such engineer(s) or geologist(s) and of any con-
18 tractors and subcontractors to be used in carrying out the terms
19 of this Order in advance of their involvement at the site.

20 XI. Quality Assurance

21 Respondents shall use quality assurance, quality control,
22 and chain-of-custody procedures in accordance with EPA Guidance
23 Document QAMS-005/80 throughout all activities. Respondents
24 shall consult with EPA in planning for sampling and analysis.
25 Respondents shall provide quality control reports to EPA and
26 California DOHS certifying that all activities have been per-
27 formed as approved, in accordance with paragraph XII below.

28 ///

1 XII. Reporting

2 The Respondents shall provide written progress reports to
3 EPA, due on the fifth day of each month after the effective date
4 of this Order, describing all activities undertaken pursuant to
5 the Order in the previous month, and activities planned for the
6 then current and next coming months.

7 XIII. Site Access

8 Access to the site shall be provided to EPA and California
9 DOHS employees, contractors and consultants and all Respondents,
10 at all reasonable times. Nothing in this paragraph is intended
11 to limit in any way the right of entry or inspection that EPA
12 may otherwise have by operation of any law.

13 XIV. Government Liabilities

14 The United States shall not be liable for any injuries or
15 damages to persons or property resulting from acts or omissions
16 by the Respondents, its employees, agents or contractors in carry-
17 ing out activities pursuant to this Order, nor shall the Federal
18 Government be held as a party to any contract entered into by the
19 Respondents or its agents in carrying out activities pursuant to
20 this Order.

21 XV. Notice of Intent to Comply

22 Each respondent shall inform EPA, in writing, within seven (7)
23 days after the effective date of this Order, of its intent to
24 comply with the terms of the Order.

25 XVI. Notifications

26 All submittals and notifications to EPA pursuant to this
27 Order shall be made to:

28 ///

1 Director, Toxics and Waste Management Division (T-1)
2 Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
3 215 Fremont Street
4 San Francisco, CA 94105.

5 Copies of all submittals and notifications shall be sent
6 simultaneously to:

7 Thomas Bailey
8 Toxics Substances Control Division
9 California Department of Health Services
10 714 P Street
11 Sacramento, California 95814

12 All approvals and decisions of EPA made regarding such submittals
13 and notifications shall be communicated to Respondents by the
14 Director, Toxics and Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental
15 Protection Agency, Region 9. No informal advice, guidance, sug-
16 gestions or comments by EPA regarding reports, plans, specifica-
17 tions, schedules or any other writing submitted by Respondent
18 shall be construed to relieve Respondent of its obligation
19 to obtain such formal approvals as may be required herein.

20 XVII. On-Scene Representative

21 EPA shall appoint an On-Site Representative (OSR) who shall
22 have authority to be on-site at all times when response work is
23 being undertaken pursuant to this Order. The OSR shall have at
24 least the authority to: (1) take samples or direct the type,
25 quantity and location of samples to be taken by Respondents; (2)
26 direct that work stop for a period not to exceed 72 hours whenever
27 the OSR determines that activities at the site may create an
28 immediate and significant threat to public health or welfare or
the environment; (3) observe, take photographs and make such
other reports on the progress of the work as the OSR deems appro-
priate; (4) review records, files and documents relevant to the

1 Order; and (5) make or authorize minor field modifications in
2 the studies, techniques, procedures or design utilized in carry-
3 ing out this Order which are necessary to the completion of the
4 project. The absence of the OSR from the site shall not be
5 cause for stoppage of work. The OSR shall have the same author-
6 ity as that vested in the "On-Scene Coordinator" by 40 CFR §300
7 et seq., published at 42 Fed.Reg. 31180 (July 16, 1982).

8 XVIII. Parties Bound

9 This Order shall apply to and be binding upon the Respondents,
10 their officers, directors, agents, employees, contractors,
11 successors, and assigns.

12 XIX. Opportunity to Confer

13 The Respondents may request, within seven (7) days after
14 receipt of this Order, a conference with EPA to be held within
15 fourteen (14) days of the date of issuance to discuss this Order,
16 including its applicability, the factual determinations upon
17 which the Order is based, the appropriateness of any actions
18 which the Respondents are ordered to take, or any other relevant
19 and material issues or contentions which Respondents may have
20 regarding this Order. Respondents may appear in person or by an
21 attorney or other representative at any conference held at its
22 request. Any request for a conference should be made to:

23 William D. Wick
24 Assistant Regional Counsel
25 EPA, Region 9
26 215 Fremont Street
27 San Francisco, CA 94105
28 (415) 974-8039

27 ///

28 ///

1 XX. Effective Date

2 This Order is effective twenty-one (21) days after the
3 date of issuance, notwithstanding any conferences requested
4 pursuant to paragraph XIX above, and all times for performance
5 or response activities shall be calculated from that date.

6
7
8 Date of Issuance: 20 JUL 1984

By: 

Judith E. Ayres
Regional Administrator
U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Region 9
215 Fremont Street
San Francisco, CA 94105